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#### The NC’s advocacy that we shouldn’t promote a Living Wage so poorer citizens will fight and die for our wealthy propagates power domination over lower classes. Bica 11

"Rich Man's War and a Poor Man's Fight" Sunday, 13 February 2011 10:02 By [Camillo Mac Bica](http://truth-out.org/archive/component/k2/itemlist/user/34421?Itemid=252), t r u t h o u t | Op-Ed | name.

Nor was it illegal: [The Conscription (Enrollment) Act](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enrollment_Act), passed by Congress in 1863 to address a manpower shortage in the Union Army, allowed an exemption from military service to those who either paid a "commutation fee" of $300 or, like Carnegie, hired a substitute. Since only the privileged, wealthier citizens could afford such a remittance, military service, fighting and dying, became the exclusive burden of the poor and the working classes. As a consequence, those who were "condemned to serve," and perhaps to die, viewed their conscription as forced servitude in a "rich man's war and a poor man's fight," the rallying cry that mobilized thousands to take to the streets in protest. During one such uprising, the 1863 [New York Draft Riots](http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/317749.html), some 2,000 protesters were killed and 8,000 injured, according to one estimate. I believe the protester's resentment and dissatisfaction with the Civil War draft and its exemption policy was not only understandable, but justifiable. According to [contractarians](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/contractarianism/) like John Locke[(3)](http://truth-out.org/archive/component/k2/item/94447:rich-mans-war-and-a-poor-mans-fight#3.) , whose thinking profoundly [influenced the Republicanism](http://en.citizendium.org/wiki/Republicanism,_U.S.) of our founding fathers, military service, especially in times of national emergency, becomes an obligation and civic responsibility of ALL able-bodied citizens in the state. Ideally, these citizen soldiers act from obligation, civic virtue, patriotism and love of country. Any exemption from military service, other than for physical or psychological disability, ignores the universality requirement of this civic (and moral?) obligation and violates the American ideals of fairness and shared sacrifice. During the final years of the Vietnam War, Congress, at the behest of President Richard M. Nixon, refused to extend the draft law. Military conscription expired automatically on July 1, 1973, ushering in a new era of the all-volunteer force (AVF). Sadly, however, war continues to be a national pastime. Throughout its existence and especially as the cost in blood, sanity and lives mount in the "war on terrorism" - now America's longest war - it becomes apparent, not unsurprisingly perhaps, that civic obligation, patriotism and love of country prove insufficient motivation to bring adequate numbers of enlistees to the recruitment station. If the AVF was to succeed, more aggressive - though in the view of some, morally questionable - recruitment practices would be necessary. Highly funded and technologically sophisticated TV commercials for military services that accentuate the mythological (adventure, glory, heroism, nobility) and the practical (a steady paycheck, money for college etc.), while ignoring its less attractive aspects (injury, death, loss of rights etc.), appear with regularity during broadcasts of sporting events, rock concerts etc. Military recruiters are frequent visitors to high schools, college campuses, NASCAR races, air shows, street fairs etc., trading military T-shirts, dog tags, key chains, violent video games etc. for contact information, impressing children and young adults with displays of military machinery, weaponry and interactive war games. Probably the greatest asset, however, to enabling the AVF to meet its manpower requirements, as it strains to wage three wars and occupations, is the state of the economy. With the official unemployment rate at about 9.5 percent, with jobs being outsourced at a rate of about 12,000-15,000 per month, with over 1.2 million more Americans expected to [lose their homes](http://www.wtopnews.com/?nid=25&sid=1863430) to foreclosure in 2011 and with deep cuts in scholarships and Pell Grants, recruiters can now entice prospective enlistees with generous enlistment bonuses, steady salaries and a comprehensive GI Bill to pay their college tuition, fees and living expenses should they choose to continue their education upon completion of their enlistment contr act. While motivations may be complex, I think it fair to say that, given these dreadful economic realities, military service in the AVF has become a "job to be filled by cash inducements," and the citizen soldier, driven by civic obligation, patriotism and love of country, has been replaced by [homo economicus](http://www.international.ucla.edu/article.asp?parentid=2643) - a professional military of individuals motivated primarily by need and the realization that, in order to provide for themselves and their families or go to college, few if any alternatives are available to them other than military service. This is not to say, of course, that there are members of the military who are not motivated by such things, especially among the officer corps, or that homo economicus is not patriotic or does not love his country. It is just that, were it not for the economic incentives, they, like their more privileged counterparts, would have been less likely to enlist. Further, to point out how the government exploits economic inequities to increase enlistment is not to belittle the personal sacrifices of those who serve out of love of country. Rather, it is to call attention to the prevalence of unequal sacrifice, an injustice that must be remedied. In light of such coercive economic conditions, perhaps the term "all volunteer force" is a misnomer, as enlistees can hardly be said to have chosen military service voluntarily. Despite the deep recession, not all segments of American society are suffering economically. Banking and corporate executives, for example, continue to enjoy lucrative salaries and bonuses. Under the war economy, Main Street struggles, Wall Street thrives and America suffers the largest income gap between its richest and poorest citizens in recorded history. Consequently, although the draft with its exemption clause may be gone, little has changed since the Civil War. The children of the privileged and the wealthy, uncoerced by economic need, feel no compunction to place their physical and mental well-being in jeopardy by enlisting in the military. As a result of this extreme economic inequity and the AVF's economic incentives, the modern equivalent of the substitution fee, once again the burden of fighting and dying falls upon the poor and working classes. Consequently, the AVF, not unlike the draft-military of 1873, smacks of classism and remains unrepresentative of American society. In fact, it may be even more insidious. During the Civil War, draft dodgers like Carnegie were at least required to pay the commutation or substitution fee out of their own pockets. In the AVF, it is paid for by the taxpayers. Ironically, given the system of taxation in this country that provides lucrative corporate tax loopholes and tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans, these economic incentives to military service (i.e., the pay raises, enlistment bonuses, GI Bill etc.) are paid for, not by those who are spared (i.e., the privileged and the wealthy), but rather by those who are required, by economic need, to make the sacrifice, enlist in the military and risk injury and death in war - the poor and the working class. One may argue, however, that my thesis that the AVF is unrepresentative of American society is disproved by the oft-cited [Heritage Foundation Study](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2008/08/who-serves-in-the-us-military-the-demographics-of-enlisted-troops-and-officers), "Who Serves in the U.S. Military? The Demographics of Enlisted Troops and Officers," by Shanea Watkins Ph.D. and James Sherk, published on August 21, 2008. According to this Study's findings: "Members of the all-volunteer military are significantly more likely to come from high-income neighborhoods than from low-income neighborhoods ... One quarter of enlisted recruits come from the wealthiest fifth of U.S. neighborhoods." I think, however, that even a cursory review of the study reveals that its methodology is flawed and its conclusions unsubstantiated. For example, isn't the importance and purpose of this study to determine the economic status not of the neighborhoods from which recruits come, but rather of those individuals who actually serve in the military? If so, then why distract the reader with tangential information that may or may not be relevant to making this determination. To their credit, the researchers acknowledge and explain this crucial flaw in their data: "Individual or family income data on enlistees do not exist. The Defense Department does not maintain records on the household income of recruits or officers." But, yet, despite this alleged unavailability of data, the researchers draw their conclusions about the economic status of enlistees, based not on sound factual evidence, but, rather, on approximation, speculation and assumption. "For example, 10 recruits in 2006 came from census tract 013306 in San Diego. Accordingly, we assigned to each of these 10 recruits a median household income of $57,380 per year (in 2008 dollars), the median income of that tract in the 2000 Census." After having approximated the household income of each recruit based upon the median household income of the census tract in which they lived, the researchers, as part of their "improved methodology," recorded their findings into [quintiles](http://www.heritage.org/static/reportimages/360142B8859DD8EDA9D80F008077F3B5.gif). The first quintile included those making $0-$33,267, the second $33,268-$42,039, the third $42,040-$51,127, the fourth $51,128-$65,031 and the fifth, $65,032-$246,333. Here, again, there is cause for concern as the fifth quintile, the one designated by the researchers as the "wealthiest Americans," is clearly suspect. Besides the fact that designating individuals with an annual income of $65,031 as the "wealthiest Americans" is ludicrous, the fifth quintile is three times greater than the previous four combined. Was this an oversight or a blatant attempt to fabricate findings that indicate a greater representation of the "wealthiest Americans" in the military? In drawing their conclusions, the researchers interpret their data as follows: "... more than three-quarters (76.5%) of enlisted recruits come from neighborhoods where the median family income is more than $40,000 per year." What Watkins and Sherk fail to mention, however, is that their [findings](http://www.heritage.org/static/reportimages/045130A94EE437E6D7284160BBAA2862.gif) also indicate that more than three-quarters (75.03 percent) of enlisted recruits come from neighborhoods with incomes of less than $65,000, and only 6.15 percent from neighborhoods with an income of over $90,000. Had the researchers divided this fifth quintile into sets more commensurate with the first four, say in increments of about $12,000-$15,000, their findings would have further corroborated my contention that the number of individuals with military service decrease exponentially as the levels of income increase. Also indicated is that not one individual from a household with an income exceeding $246,333, the demographic more reasonably designated as the "wealthiest Americans," serves in the military. Given these and other discrepancies and abnormalities, it is clear that the Heritage Foundation Study is flawed, that it is either sloppy research or intended to deceive. In either case, it warrants little if any credibility and, not only does it fail to refute my thesis, it affirms it.

#### Insidious policies like the NC not only tell poor people their lives don’t matter, but actively take steps to kill them. The K outweighs – the NC creates invisible violence and ontological annihilation that’s worse than death. Torres 07

[Nelson Maldonado-Torres, Ph.D in Religious Studies, with distinction, Phi Beta Kappa, Brown University, “ON THE COLONIALITY OF BEING Contributions to the development of a Concept” [Page](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548) 256-259, <http://www.decolonialtranslation.com/english/maldonado-on-the-coloniality-of-being.pdf>, accessed 7-18-14]

For Fanon, in the colonial context, ontological colonial difference or subontological difference profoundly marks the day to day reality. If the most basic ontological question is ‘why are things rather than nothing’, the question that emerges in this context and that opens up reflection on the coloniality of Being is ‘Why go on?’ As Lewis Gordon has put it, ‘why go on?’ is a fundamental question in the existential philosophy of the African diaspora and it illuminates the plight of the wretched of the earth .59 Why go on? is preceded only by one expression, which becomes the first instance that revels the coloniality of Being, that is, the cry .60 The cry, not a word but an interjection, is a call of attention to one’s own existence. The cry is the pre-theoretical expression of the question Why go on? which for the most part drives theoretical reflection in the peoples of the African diaspora. It is the cry that animates the birth of theory and critical thought. And the cry points to a peculiar existential condition: that of the condemned. The damned or condemned is not a ‘being there’ but a non-being or rather, as Ralph Ellison so eloquently elaborated, a sort of an invisible entity.61 What is invisibleabout the person of coloris its very humanity, and this is in fact what the cry tries to call attention to. Invisibility and dehumanization are the primary expressions of the coloniality of Being. The coloniality of Being indicates those aspects that produce exception from the order of Being; it is as it were, the product of the excess of Being that in order to maintain its integrity and inhibit the interruption by what lies beyond Being produces its contrary, not nothing, but a non-human or rather an inhuman world. The coloniality of Being refers not merely to the reduction of the particular to the generality of the concept or any given horizon of meaning, but to the violation of the meaning of human alterity to the point where the alter-ego becomes a sub-alter. Such a reality, typically approximated very closely in situations of war, is transformed into an ordinary affair through the idea of race, which serves a crucial role in the naturalization of the non-ethics of war through the practices of colonialism and (racial) slavery. The coloniality of Being is not therefore an inevitable moment or natural outcome of the dynamics of creation of meaning. Although it is always present as a possibility, it shows itself forth when the preservation of Being (in any of its determinations: national ontologies, identitarian ontologies, etc.) takes primacy over listening to the cries of those whose humanity is being denied. The coloniality of Being appears in historical projects and ideas of civilization which advance colonial projects of various kinds inspired or legitimized by the idea of race. The coloniality of Being is therefore coextensive with the production of the color-line in its different expressions and dimensions. It becomes concrete in the appearance of liminal subjects, which mark, as it were, the limit of Being, that is, the point at which Being distorts meaning and evidence to the point of dehumanization. The coloniality of Being produces the ontological colonial difference, deploying a series of fundamental existential characteristics and symbolic realities. I have sketched out some. An ample discussion will require another venue. What I would like to do here is to show the relevance of the categories that have been introduced so far for the project of decolonization, which is, ultimately, the positive dimension that inspires this analysis. Like I did in this section, let me begin once more with what we have discovered as our radical point of departure: the damne´. Decolonization and ‘des-gener-accio´n’ of being62 What is the meaning of damne´? The damne´ is the subject that emerges in a world marked by the coloniality of Being. The damne´, as Fanon put it, has nonontological resistance in the eyes of the dominant group. The damne´ is either invisible or excessively visible. The damne´ exists in the mode of not-being there, which hints at the nearness of death, at the company of death. The damne´ is a concrete being but it is also a transcendental concept. Emile Benveniste has shown that the term damne´ is etymologically related to the concept of donner , which means, to give. The damne´ is literally the subject who cannot give because what he or she has has been taken from him or her.63 This means that the damne´ is a subject from whom the capacity to have and to give have been taken away from her and him. The coloniality of Being is thus fundamentally an ontological dynamic that aims to obliterate in its literal sense of doing away completely so as to leave no trace gift-giving and generous reception as a fundamental character of being-in-the-world. Emmanuel Le´vinas argues that gift-giving and reception are fundamental traits of the self. Giving is first and foremost for Le´vinas a metaphysical act that makes possible the communication between a self and an Other as transontological as well as the sharing of a common world. Without giving to an Other there would be no self just as without receiving from the Other there would be no reason. In short, without a trans-ontological moment there would be no self, no reason, and no Being. The trans-ontological is the foundation of the ontological. For Le´vinas, the ontological, the realm of being, comes to exist out of the introduction of justice into the trans-ontological relation, which introduces measure and synchronicity in the order of the fundamentally diachronic.64 The ontological comes to be at the expense of the transontological. The ontological thus carries with it the marks of both positive achievement and betrayal of the trans-ontological relation, a relation of radical givenness and reception. According to Le´vinas, ontology is a philosophy of power. It is a discourse that, when taken as foundation or ultimate end, it gives priority to an anonymous Being over and beyond the self-Other relation it gives priority to the ontological rather than to the trans-ontological, and to authenticity rather than to radical responsibility. When ontology is conceived as fundamental, the self-Other relation becomes a secondary dimension of the subject. It is also seen as a source of the potential forgetfulness of Being and thus as a departure from authenticity. Le´vinas argues precisely the contrary: it is the forgetting of the self-Other relation that characterizes the return of ontology as fundamental, which can lead, not to lacking authenticity, but to a renunciation of responsibility and justice. That is so because being is always already a betrayal of sorts of the trans-ontological relation (of gift and reception between self and Other), and it tends to forgetting . That is, being presents itself as the foundation of reality when it is not. This happens because once being is born, it tends to preserve itself and to present itself as autonomous foundation. But, preservation and autonomy can be achieved at the expense of the transontological. Being thus aims to eliminate the traces of the trans-ontological**.** This is done, both, by philosophical accounts that attempt to reduce the self-Other relation to knowledge or being, and by ways of thinking, concrete policies, and historical projects that reduce the significance of givenness, generosity, hospitality, and justice. Clearly enough, Levinas saw Nazism and ON THE COLON IA LI T Y OF BEING 259 the Jewish Holocaust as radical betrayals of the trans-ontological dimension of human reality, and thus, of the very meaning of the human as such. Thus, Nazism represented not only a threat to European nations and many minorities within Europe, but also a crucial moment in the history of being. The presence of anti-Semitism, Aryanism, and other forms of racial prejudices in Nazism, make clear that race and racism occupv an special place in that historv.

#### The alternative is to vote affirmative in order to reject the representations of the NC. That solves – their uniqueness evidence indicates that military recruitment from all social classes are participating in the military.